



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Sp
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,477	10/23/2000	Gilbert Moineau	SWA-003 US	8162
7590	06/28/2005		EXAMINER	
Piper Marbury Rudnick & Wolfe 1200 Nineteenth Street NW Washington, DC 20036-2412			BATES, KEVIN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/830,477	MOINEAU ET AL.
	Examiner Kevin Bates	Art Unit 2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on August 4, 2004.

The Foreign Priority Documents were received on September 1, 2004.

Claims 1, 4, and 13 have been amended.

Claims 10 and 20 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-22 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia (6023724) in view of Allard (5729689).

Regarding claim 1, Bhatia teaches a network modern device connecting a Local Area Network (LAN) to a remote network (Column 4, lines 36 – 39), comprising: a local store containing a list of host names and attribute data (Column 6, lines 1 – 8); a Domain Name Service (DNS) relay module (Column 6, lines 15 – 18); and a router having a LAN interface connected to said LAN (Figure 1, element 340; Column 14, lines 19 – 20), a local connection to said DNS relay module and a network connection, to said remote network (Column 4, lines 45 – 47; Column 6, lines 11 – 14), wherein said

Art Unit: 2155

DNS relay module uses said list and said attribute data to respond to requests, received from said LAN via said muter on said local connection (Column 6, lines 1 – 8), for a numeric address in response to a domain name when said domain name requested is on said list (Column 6, lines 15 – 18), and said DNS relay module generates a DNS request and transmits said DNS request to an external DNS on said remote network via said local connection to said router, and said DNS relay module returning a reply from said external DNS to said LAN via said local connection to said router to respond to said request for a numeric address when said domain name requested is not on said list (Column 6, lines 15 – 29), but Bhatia does not explicitly indicate a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and that the DNS relay module uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name. Allard teaches a network device that connects a LAN and remote network which includes a proxy name cache (Figure 2, elements 14 and 54). The network device includes a DNX Proxy name cache that maintains a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data (Column 15, lines 64 – 66) and uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name (Column 17, lines 2 – 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Allard's teaching in Bhatia's system in order to allow Bhatia's system to allow the system to reduce the number of times the network device needs to query the name server (Column 8, lines 41 – 49).

Regarding claim 2, Bhatia teaches that said attribute data is an IP address (Column 6, lines 4 – 5).

Regarding claim 3, Bhatia teaches that said attribute data identifies a domain or host name as a local station on said LAN and said, DNS relay module, when said domain or host name is identified as a local station on said LAN, replies locally to said request (Column 6, lines 1 – 18).

Regarding claim 4, Bhatia teaches that said remote network connection is a connection to at least one ISDN channel (Column 4, lines 36 – 39).

Regarding claim 5, Bhatia teaches that said router is connected to two ISDN channels: one for the intranet and one for the Internet (Column 5, line 64 – Column 6, line 1).

Regarding claim 6, Bhatia teaches that said DNS relay module listens to NetBIOS Over IP packets of information on said LAN, extracts local computer names and associated IP addresses from said packets and adds said computer names and associated IP addresses to said list of domain names (Column 4, lines 56 – 61).

Regarding claim 8, Bhatia teaches that said device is a digital network modem (Column 4, lines 36 – 39).

Regarding claim 9, Bhatia teaches that said device is an ISDN modem (Column 4, lines 36 – 39).

Regarding claim 13, Bhatia teaches a method for relaying DNS requests on a LAN connected through a router to a remote network by a network modem device (Column 4, lines 36 – 39), comprising: a Domain Name Service (DNS) relay module

(Column 6, lines 11 – 14) receiving a domain name request via said router having a LAN interface connected to said LAN (Figure 1, element 340; Column 14, lines 19 – 20), a local connection to said DNS relay module and a network connection to said remote network, on said local connection, for a numeric address in response to a domain name (Column 6, lines 1 – 18); said DNS relay module using a local store containing a list of domain or host names and attribute data to respond to said request when said domain name requested is on said list (Column 6, line 1 – 8), wherein said list comprises a list of host names declared on said LAN with corresponding attributed data (Column 6, lines 1 – 8); and said DNS relay module generating a DNS request and transmitting said DNS request to an external DNS on said remote network via said local connection to said router, and said DNS relay module returning a reply from said external DNS to said LAN via sold local connection to said router to respond to said request for a numeric address when said domain name requested is not on said list (Column 6, lines 15 – 29) but Bhatia does not explicitly indicate a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and that the DNS relay module uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name. Allard teaches a network device that connects a LAN and remote network which includes a proxy name cache (Figure 2, elements 14 and 54). The network device includes a DNX Proxy name cache that maintains a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data (Column 15, lines 64 – 66) and uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name (Column 17, lines 2 – 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Allard's teaching in Bhatia's system in order to allow Bhatia's system to allow the system to reduce the number of times the network device needs to query the name server (Column 8, lines 41 – 49).

Regarding claim 14, Bhatia teaches that said attribute data identifies a domain name as a domain name for a device on said LAN (Column 6, lines 15 – 18).

Regarding claim 15, Bhatia teaches that said generating comprises requesting a numeric address on said external DNS and responding to said request with a numeric address corresponding to said domain or host name (Column 6, lines 4 – 29).

Regarding claim 16, Bhatia teaches that said attribute data is an IP address (Column 6, lines 4 – 5).

Regarding claim 17, Bhatia teaches steps of listening to NetBIOS Over IP packets of information, extracting local computer names and IP addresses from said packets and adding said computer names and IP addresses to said list of domain names (Column 4, lines 56 – 61).

Regarding claim 18, Bhatia teaches that said list of computer names declared on the LAN is automatically built using packets of information sent by stations on said LAN using NetBIOS Over IP protocol in which said station name and IP address is available (Column 4, lines 56 – 61; Column 6, lines 20 – 23).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, Bhatia teaches that said external DNS is one of a group of external DNS (Column 6, lines 5 – 6).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Bhatia does not explicitly indicate that said list is a list of domain names looked-up on the external DNS, and said DNS relay module

automatically adds to said list of domain names looked-up on the external DNS, an entry corresponding to said reply from said external DNS. Allard teaches a network device that connects a LAN and remote network which includes a proxy name cache (Figure 2, elements 14 and 54). The network device includes a DNX Proxy name cache that maintains a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data (Column 15, lines 64 – 66) and said DNS relay module automatically adds to said list of domain names looked-up on the external DNS, an entry corresponding to said reply from said external DNS (Column 16, lines 64 – 66; lines 8 – 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Allard's teaching in Bhatia's system in order to allow Bhatia's system to allow the system to reduce the number of times the network device needs to query the name server (Column 8, lines 41 – 49).

Regarding claims 12 and 22, Bhatia in combination with Allard teaches that said list of domain names and attribute date has an expiry date and time, and said DNS relay module comprises a mechanism for requesting from an external DNS a newly fetched numeric address for said domain name when a next request for said domain name will be received, for restoring said newly fetched numeric address as the attribute data for said domain name in said list and for refreshing said expiry date and time (Allard, Column 9, lines 21 – 36).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6157942 issued to Chu, because it discloses dynamically caching DNS information at a site more local to the client.

U. S. Patent No. 6167446 issued to Lister, because it discloses a name resolution relay module.

U. S. Patent No. 6480508 issued to Mwikalo, because it discloses a local network node connecting a LAN and a remote network that contains a cache of looked up DNS requests.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
June 22, 2005



SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER